



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/712,930	11/16/2000	Nancy Berger	BS00-118	3156

7590 12/22/2004
Whithers & Keys LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, GA 30007-1355

EXAMINER

AVELLINO, JOSEPH E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 12/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p align="center">Office Action Summary</p>	Application No. 09/712,930	Applicant(s) BERGER ET AL.	
	Examiner Joseph E. Avellino	Art Unit 2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 November 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-34 are pending in this examination with claims 1, 16, 22, 26, 30 and 34 being independent. Claim 34 is newly added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 9, 14, 16, 20, 22, 23, 25-27, 29-31, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fang et al. (USPN 6,243,816) (hereinafter Fang).

2. Referring to claim 1, Fang discloses a system for integrated processing of information from a plurality of data systems, the system comprising:

a first network connection (1, 3), the first network connection adapted to receive information sent from a terminal over a first network and also adapted to received information set to the terminal (Figure 3);

Art Unit: 2143

a plurality of data system connections 6, each data system connection of the plurality of data system connections adapted to receive information sent to a respective data system of the plurality of data systems (Figure 3);

a server coupled to the first network connection and the plurality of data system connections, the server including:

a processor (an inherent feature of any machine running the operating systems described in col. 4, lines 7-14);

a memory coupled to the processor, the memory including a plurality of data system instructions objects (i.e. id/password combinations), wherein each data system instructions object of the plurality of data system instructions objects corresponds to a respective data system of the plurality of data systems, and wherein each data system instructions object manages communications between the terminal and the respective data system of the plurality of data systems by the data system instructions object if the plurality that corresponds to a particular data system communicating through an applications interface with the terminal to exchange data relevant to the particular data system and by the data systems' instruction object communicating with the corresponding data system through a separate applications interface from the communications with the terminal in order to exchange data between the data systems instruction object and the data system (i.e. it is managed by the object since if the object does not approve of the connection to the data system, it is not allowed) (e.g. abstract; Figure 6; col. 4, lines 1-6; col. 5, lines 1-20; col. 6, lines 42-49; col. 6, line 64 to col. 7, line 30).

Art Unit: 2143

3. Referring to claim 5, Fang discloses the memory includes a user profile (i.e. a login coordinator; Figure 5), wherein the user profile instructions object:
 - receives login information of a user from the terminal (Figure 3; col. 6, lines 42-45); and
 - determines the access rights of the user for each respective data system of the plurality of data systems (col. 6, lines 42-49).
4. Referring to claim 6, Fang discloses the plurality of data systems instructions objects are object-oriented software modules (the Office takes the term "object-oriented" to mean "able to organize the software modules in a hierarchal manner") (Figure 10 and pertinent portions of the disclosure).
5. Referring to claim 9, Fang discloses the first network connection is a WAN port (i.e. Internet) (col. 12, lines 44-45).
6. Referring to claim 14, Fang discloses each data system being coupled to the server via a respective data system connection of the plurality of data system connections (Figure 3).
7. Claims 16, 20, 22, 23, 25-27, 29-31, and 33 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above. Furthermore Fang discloses sending the data system access rights

Art Unit: 2143

information to a terminal based at least in part on the determined set of data systems of the plurality of data systems to which the user has access (Figure 6 and related portions of the disclosure).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 2, 4, 15, 17, 24, 28, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fang in view of Star (US Pre-Grant Pub. 2002/0062270).

Art Unit: 2143

10. Referring to claim 2, Fang discloses the invention substantively as described in claim 1. Fang furthermore discloses the plurality of data system connections includes a first data system connection and a second data system connection, and the plurality of data system instructions objects include a first data system instructions object and a second data systems instructions object, wherein the first data systems instructions object is different from the second data systems instructions object (Figure 5 and related portions of the disclosure). Fang does not specifically state that the first data system connection and the second data system connection are selected from the group consisting of a credit services system connection, an inventory services system connection, a customer services system connection, and an activations system connection and the plurality of data system instructions objects are selected from the group consisting of a credit services instructions object, an inventory services instructions object, customer services instructions object, and an activations system instructions object. In analogous art, Star discloses another integrated processing system from a plurality of data systems wherein the first data system connection and the second data system connection are selected from the group consisting of a credit services system connection, an inventory services system connection, a customer services system connection, and an activations system connection and the plurality of data system instructions objects are selected from the group consisting of a credit services instructions object, an inventory services instructions object, customer services instructions object, and an activations system instructions object (pp. 3-4, ¶ 24; p. 5, ¶ 33). It would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

Art Unit: 2143

was made to combine the teaching of Star with Fang to facilitate a small business with the services required for managing the day-to-day financial transactions of the company as supported by Star (p. 1, ¶ 8).

11. Referring to claim 4, Fang discloses the invention substantively as described in claim 1. Fang does not specifically disclose the memory includes an accounting services instructions object. In analogous art, Star discloses another integrated processing system from a plurality of data systems wherein the memory includes an accounting services instructions object (pp. 3-4, ¶ 24). It would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Star with Fang to facilitate a small business with the services required for managing the day-to-day financial transactions of the company as supported by Star (p. 1, ¶ 8).

12. Claims 15, 17, 24, 28, and 32 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Claims 8, 10, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fang in view of Koenig et al. (USPN 6,101,198) (hereinafter Koenig).

13. Fang discloses the invention substantively as described in claim 1. Fang does not disclose having a second network connection being adapted to receive information sent from the terminal over the second network and also adapted to receive information sent to the terminal, wherein the second network is different from the first network.

Art Unit: 2143

Koenig discloses a computer terminal having a second network connection (i.e. another Internet port, HTTP port) being adapted to receive information sent from the terminal over the second network and also adapted to receive information sent to the terminal, wherein the second network is different from the first network (e.g. abstract; Figure 4; col. 7, line 56 to col. 8, line 9). It would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Koenig with Fang to allow a redundant backup system in case a connection fails, thereby increasing customer service and reliability.

14. Claim 12 is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Claims 3, 11, 13, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fang in view of Cusack et al (US 2003/0120546) (hereinafter Cusack).

15. Referring to claim 3, Fang discloses the invention substantively as described in claim 1. Fang does not disclose a POS database coupled to the server and the memory includes a POS services instructions object. Cusack discloses another system for integrated processing of multiple data systems which includes a POS database (152; Figure 1B) and the memory includes a POS services instructions object (pp. 6-7 ¶ 57). It would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Cusack with Fang to provide viable real-time

Art Unit: 2143

implementation of POS transactions without causing significant burdens to network infrastructures or undue increases in infrastructure costs as supported by Cusack (pp. 1-2; ¶ 11).

16. Claims 11, 13, and 18, are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Claims 19 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fang in view of Cusack as used in the rejections above, and further in view of Levie et al. (USPN 6,065,679) (hereinafter Levie).

17. Referring to claim 19, Fang in view of Cusack disclose the invention substantively as described in claim 18. Fang in view of Cusack do not specifically disclose having POS offline instructions to provide POS application functions wherein a data connection between the terminal and server is inoperable, and a persistent message queue to store the POS application information. Levie discloses another POS application system which includes having POS offline instructions to provide POS application functions wherein a data connection between the terminal and server is inoperable, and a persistent message queue to store the POS application information (col. 64, lines 56 to col. 65, line 15). It would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Levie with Fang and Cusack to allow financial transactions to occur wherein there is no environment

Art Unit: 2143

which does not provide access phone lines or networks as supported by Levie (col. 65, lines 1-10).

18. Claim 34 is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Claims 7 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fang in view of Porter (USPN 6,714,978).

19. Referring to claim 7, Fang discloses the invention substantively as described in claim 1. Fang does not disclose the plurality of data systems instructions objects are Java beans. Porter discloses another system of record transaction processing which shows data instructions objects as Java beans (col. 21, lines 1-2). It would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Porter with Fang because it would provide for reduced complexity of the system while allowing for the ease of future upgrades or replacements and software enhancements.

20. Claim 21 is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Response to Amendment

21. Claim 19 was originally objected to as being allowable, however after further review and search of the prior art, this objection has been withdrawn since relevant art has been found which discloses the claimed limitations.

22. Applicant's arguments filed October 7, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

23. Applicant argues, in substance, that (1) Fang discloses the client logs onto the various network resources and the client is performing the sign-on for the resources, rather than the claimed invention of the server performing the sign-on for the resources on behalf of the client, and (2) Fang does not disclose the user communicating with the terminal and data systems at the application level.

24. As to point (1) Applicant's attention is turned to col. 4, lines 1-6, and col. 11, lines 50-60 wherein the SSO mechanism requires both server 20 and client runtime services (i.e. GUI interfaces) on the workstations 14, 16, and 18 and a single sign-on centralized server. Furthermore the Personal Key Manager 24 of Fang is a Global manager, which manages all the passwords and is accessible from all client machines in a given domain (col. 5, lines 20-35; col. 11, lines 12-33). The mechanism allows the user to remember one password and the mechanism (not the client terminal) performs the subsequent logging into the different systems by acquiring the keys from the key manager (col. 6,

Art Unit: 2143

lines 50-63). By this rationale, the client does not perform the sign-on to the various sign-ons and the rejection is maintained.

25. As to point (2), Applicant's attention is directed towards col. 6, lines 12-41. Fang discloses receiving login information from a terminal through an application interface (i.e. the GUI which then determines which systems/applications the user is able to logon to based on the user profile instruction objects (i.e. the username/password combinations). The Office takes this GUI as described in col. 6, lines 21-41 can be broadly construed as an "application interface" since it allows the user to interact with the various applications and systems the user is authenticated to access. By this rationale, the rejection is upheld.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph E. Avellino whose telephone number is (571) 272-3905. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00-4:00.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2143

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JEA

November 29, 2004


Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2143
William C. Laughlin